Logistics-Related DoD Executive Agents
An Assessment

Matthew F. DiFiore
Laurence Glicoes

20010410 198

Logistics-Related DoD Executive Agents

An Assessment

JS713R1

October 2000

Matthew F. DiFiore
Laurence Glicoes

Logistics-Related DoD Executive Agents:
An Assessment
JS713R1/OCTOBER 2000

Executive Summary

In the Department of Defense (DoD), the term "executive agent" or "executive agency" (EA) is used to broadly describe the delegation of authority to perform specific functions. However, this term has been misused, in some cases, because the authority was not delegated in accordance with legislative requirements or the authority conveyed was not executive agency. In preparation for the Mobility Requirements Study 2005 (MRS05), the Joint Staff, J4, tasked LMI to assess current delegations of logistics and mobilization executive agency. In addition, the task required LMI to recommend new delegations of logistics-related executive agency, if required.

We began by reviewing service input to the Task Force on Defense Reform, DoD issuances (directives, instructions, and related documents), Joint publications, selected operations plans, and combatant commander delegations related to logistics.

We found that

♦ EA delegations are mentioned in 80 DoD issuances, 20 of interest to the J4, but officially only 5 are DoD-directed logistics wartime EA delegations. The DoD issuance process and administrative policies of the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) do not provide adequate oversight or control of directive-type memoranda that delegate EA responsibility;

♦ DoD issuances are not updated at the proper intervals (required every 5 years);

♦ some EA delegations were promulgated by OSD principal staff assistants instead of by the Secretary of Defense or the Deputy Secretary of Defense, which may invalidate the EA designation; and

♦ delegated responsibilities in DoD are not consolidated where they can be maintained or easily accessed.

We recommend the following:

◆ OSD begin to fully review EA designations at all levels (OSD, combatant command, elsewhere) immediately. The review will require 12 weeks of concentrated activity and another 26 weeks of follow-up action to complete the process.

◆ The Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) designate EAs for four additional functions, namely

➤ bridging,

➤ intermodal materiel-handling equipment,

➤ communications, and

➤ medical capability oversight.

◆ All EA delegations should be accessible via the unclassified but sensitive Internet Protocol Router Network (NIPRNET) to permit fully reviewing the scope, extent, and duties of the responsible parties. The review must include periodically reviewing, analyzing, and revalidating the EA requirements.

We base these recommendations on the reality that neither the J4 nor the Joint Staff has the authority to unilaterally correct the existing situation. Rather, OSD must be the catalyst for change. The recommendations for new EA designations reflect requirements implied by JCS Joint Vision goals. The prospective EA designations reflect a need to establish clear service responsibility for critical common capabilities essential to warfare. Further, an EA designation will ensure that the services do not duplicate their efforts and waste scarce resources.

OSD's Directorate of Administration and Management has made significant progress establishing Internet-based access to DoD issuances. However, the directorate lacks the authority to correct the many problems we uncovered relating to invalid, expired, or simply outdated DoD issuances. The directorate also is unable to make changes in OSD. We recognize that personnel turnover at the executive and action officer level along with changing organizational structure in OSD make maintaining up-to-date DoD issuances difficult by using the existing processes. For instance, the Internet-accessible index of DoD issuances is over 2 years old (February 1998).

Although we identified 20 EA delegations of interest to the Joint Staff, J4, the five that we considered for giving wartime EA responsibility are mortuary affairs, mutual logistics support, land-based water resources for Joint operations, the Armed Forces Blood Program, and explosive safety. The remaining delegations are designated as non-wartime by DoD directive (7) or are in DoD instructions (8) that are signed by OSD principal staff assistants, and, therefore, may be invalid.

Contents

TABLES

Chapter 1
Introduction

BACKGROUND

Over time, the term "executive agent" (EA) has evolved to become synonymous with the responsibilities conferred or undertaken in response to specific needs in the DoD. However, no standard process exists for designating, monitoring, or managing EA responsibilities. In the Defense establishment, the extent and importance of these tasks and their relationship to departmental goals and objectives is little appreciated or visible. The lack of appreciation and visibility results in

- ◆ EA requirements that are not visible, sized, or monitored;

- ◆ EA programs that rely on methods of determining requirements that are not uniform;

- ◆ Combatant Commander prerogatives and directives that affect EA operations and processes;

- ◆ EA requirements that affect force structure planning, in an era of force downsizing, new strategy development, and emerging technology; and

- ◆ the need for a methodology that results in EA delegations that are defined, verifiable, visible, and supportable.

STUDY OBJECTIVE

We identified and documented logistics-related EA taskings for this assessment. Anecdotal evidence indicated that the taskings were numerous; involving an inordinate burden on the services. We designed our method to identify the taskings along with their rationale for assignment. Once we identified the taskings, we expected that the responsibilities would be validated and documented.

METHOD

We reviewed Department of Defense (DoD) issuances (DoD directives and instructions), Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) memoranda, service input to

the Task Force on Defense Reform,[1] selected operations plans, combatant commander policies and regulations, Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) Joint publications, and service regulations and doctrine. These documents identified what the OSD, the Joint Staff (JS) and the services believed to be their EA responsibilities. We placed the data from the documents into a database to facilitate our analysis. If important information was missing, such as keywords or the names of responsible parties, we developed the information either by contacting the appropriate government agency or internally at LMI. If the government agent was not obvious, we used our expertise to generate input. The resulting database contains more than 1,400 entries. This database is searchable on the Internet using a Netscape browser (see http://alpha.lmi.org/dodea/worksearchdodea.htm).

The original intent of the study after the database was built, was to convene a panel of service representatives to review the EA designations and validate the taskings. The results from the review were to be reflected in the database. For a number of reasons, we did not convene the panel. First, the small number of EAs of interest to JS, J4, and the smaller number that involved wartime matters reduced the urgency. Second, OSD rather than JS designates EAs. Direct OSD interest at the proper level is needed to improve the process and provide DoD-wide visibility of tasked responsibilities.

OVERVIEW

Our research confirms that the term EA is widely misused and that wide latitude exists for commanders in the field as well as OSD to designate EAs. In addition, no DoD policy requires reporting the EA designations to the DoD level, so the extent and scope of these taskings are not visible to the services, the JS, and others. Historically, service reporting of their EA responsibilities has been inconsistent, with no indication that their reported responsibilities have been reviewed and vetted for validity or continued applicability.

Blurred Responsibilities

At the OSD, no office is clearly responsible for managing or overseeing memoranda that confer EA responsibilities. The OSD, Director of Administration and Management, is responsible for policy about the multiple document categories that are collectively known as DoD issuances. These issuances include DoD directives, DoD instructions, and DoD publications. DoD Directive (DoDD) 5025.1 contains policies and responsibilities regarding DoD issuances. The directive also defines the OSD principal staff assistants (PSAs). Among its policy statements, DoDD 5025.1 states that DoD directives "shall establish or describe policy, pro-

---

[1] Department of the Air Force, AFPM 662-97, Aug 29, 1997, Subject: Executive Agent Responsibilities; Department of the Army, DA Memo 10-1, Organizations and Functions: Executive Agent Responsibilities Assigned to the Secretary of the Army, January 15, 1997; and Department of the Navy, N42, NPM 557-97, August 28, 1997, Subject: Navy Planner's Memo on Executive Agent Responsibilities (J4A 00880-97).

grams and major activities and organizations; define missions; delegate authority; and assign responsibilities."[2] The directive authorizes publishing DoD Manual 5025.1-M, which provides guidance about preparing, coordinating, publishing, implementing, and reviewing DoD issuances. One of its policies requires reviewing DoD issuances at least every 5 years. In addition, DoD 5025.1-M states

> DoD Directives shall implement executive, legislative, or secretarial decisions; contain policy; assign responsibilities; and be approved and signed by the Secretary or Deputy Secretary of Defense. DoD Instructions shall implement DoD Directives, and executive, legislative, and secretarial policy documents; contain procedures and responsibilities; and be approved and signed by the PSAs.

The executive and legislative decisions include Executive orders and public law. Thus, DoD directives often designate the Secretary of Defense (SECDEF) as an executive agent.

DoDD 5025.1-M also indicates that

> Directive type memorandums of continuing application issued by PSAs that, because of time constraints, cannot be published in the DoD Directives System at the time of signature shall be reissued as DoD issuances within 90 days. Directive-type memorandums of a one-time nature shall not be issued in the DoD Directives System.[3]

Despite the unambiguous policy reflected above, no mechanism in OSD ensures that directive-type memorandums that have continuing application will enter the DoD Directives System. Each PSA is responsible, in their functional area, for their directive-type memorandums. No OSD-established "sunset date" for these, or other, memorandums exists. Consequently, unless the PSA cancels their own memorandums, these directive-type memorandums can and do continue indefinitely. The database we developed for this project reflects many instances of this. In addition, no formal means exists for ensuring that the point-of-contact information for these DoD issuances remains current.

PSA Perspective

DoD directives establish the authority of each PSA. Respective directives should reflect any authority conferred by law or Executive order, or the authority that is delegated by the Secretary of Defense. The DoDDs do not indicate that PSAs have the authority to designate executive agent responsibilities in DoD isssuances. Rather, the DoD directive is the means for delegating the EA and another DoD issuance provides the details or other administrative procedures. The DoD uses

---

[2] DoDD 5025.1, "DoD Directives System," page 2, para 4.1.1

[3] Ibid, page 3, para 4.5.

the following definition from Joint Publication (JP) 1-02 to define an executive agent:

Executive Agent

(DoD) A term used in Department of Defense and Service regulations to indicate a delegation of authority by a superior to a subordinate to act on behalf of the superior. An agreement between equals does not create an executive agent. For example, a Service cannot become a Department of Defense Executive Agent for a particular matter with simply the agreement of the other Services; such authority must be delegated by the Secretary of Defense. Designation as executive agent, in and of itself, confers no authority. The exact nature and scope of the authority delegated must be stated in the document designating the executive agent. An executive agent may be limited to providing only administration and support or coordinating common functions, or it may be delegated authority, direction, and control over specified resources for specified purposes.[4]

Per DoD directive, JP 1-02 is the dictionary of record for the DoD.

The specific aspects of the definition that preclude a PSA from permanently conferring EA responsibilities are the following:

♦ A superior must delegate the authority to subordinate.

♦ There cannot be an agreement among equals.

These constraints imply that a PSA cannot confer executive agent responsibility. Specific examples are a PSA delegating EA on a service (PSA is not a superior) or the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) conferring EA responsibility on a combatant commander (CJCS is not a superior) or on a service (equals).[5] An EA designation must be formalized by a DoD directive that, by DoD policy, is signed by the Secretary or Deputy Secretary of Defense. The law is specific in this matter

(c) Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, an Assistant Secretary may not issue an order to a military department unless–

(1) the Secretary of Defense has specifically delegated that authority to the Assistant Secretary in writing; and

(2) the order is issued through the Secretary of the military department concerned.[6]

---

[4] Joint Publication 1-02, "DoD Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms," March 23, 1994.

[5] The Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, can task the services and confer lead agent responsibility for matters about joint techniques, tactics, and doctrine development.

[6] 10 United States Code 138 (c).

Although a DoD directive is not, per se, an order, the current process with its lack of oversight and emphasis allows PSAs to circumvent policies designed to show EA delegations.

Administrative Procedures

As indicated above, sometimes PSAs, CJCS, and others designate an EA. At the DoD level, the designation must be a part of the DoD issuance system. However, each PSA is responsible for the administrative management in his area of responsibility. The result is that an EA can be designated without OSD cognizance of the designation.

EXAMPLE OF PSA-DESIGNATED EA

In a recent case, the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence (C3I) assigned EA responsibilities to the Army by memorandum.[7] The memorandum canceled three Assistant Secretary of Defense (ASD) C3I memorandums, September 21, 1992; August 17, 1993; and November 26, 1993, about tactical switched systems and networks. The memorandum referenced DoDD 4630.5. The reference indicates that the ASD (C3I) will "assign responsibilities and prescribe procedures, as necessary...."[8] The broad nature of this delegation does not imply the ability to delegate EA responsibilities. Currently, OSD (C3I) is not trying to incorporate this memorandum into the DoD Issuances System because it believes that it has the mandate to assign this or other responsibilities. We disagree. The responsibility conferred by this memorandum is clearly long term and involves significant effort and responsibility. Therefore, the responsibility should be delegated in a DoD directive.

This instance is symptomatic of voids in a process that encourages PSAs to accomplish decentralized policy execution but does not completely oversee mission taskings or responsibilities. Little doubt exists that the Theater Joint Tactical Networks (TJTN) efforts in DoD should be centrally integrated and controlled. However, DoD directives state that the Secretary or Under Secretary of Defense is responsible for assigning EAs. In this case, the memorandum should become a DoD directive. Simultaneously, DoDD 4630.5 should be updated. That directive has not been reviewed in 8 years, 3 years beyond the 5-year review cycle required by DoD 5025.1-M.[9]

EXAMPLE OF JOINT STAFF-DESIGNATED EA

A similar situation exists with the Secretary of Defense's designation of the Commander in Chief, US Atlantic Command [now Joint Forces Command

---

[7] ASD (C3I), Executive Agent Assignment, Subject: Theater Joint Tactical Networks (TJTN), September 27, 1999.

[8] DoDD 4630.5, "Compatibility, Interoperability, and Integration of Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence (C3I) Systems," November 12, 1992.

[9] DoD 5025.1-M, "DoD Directives System Procedures."

(JFCOM)], as the EA for Joint warfighting experimentation. The memorandum approving this assignment indicated that the mission would be included in the next update of the Unified Command Plan. The mission has been included. However, no DoD directive formally documents this EA. Rather, the basis for the EA assignment is the SECDEF's approval of the CJCS's decision memorandum that gave JFCOM the EA missions for joint warfighting capabilities.

DOCUMENTING EA DELEGATIONS

No DoD directive documents all DoD EA assignments. Instead, each DoD issuance must be reviewed individually to identify the delegation and review the responsibilities it confers. DoDD 5100.1, Functions of the Department of Defense, September 25, 1987, does not include specific EA responsibilities. DoDD 5100.1 would be an appropriate place to document EA responsibilities because the directive requires periodically reviewing the Unified Command Plan (UCP). Given the age of DoDD 5100.1, it should be reviewed and updated to ensure that changes in DoD during the last decade are captured.

Joint Staff Involvement

The JS is normally involved during the review of DoD issuances. During the past few years, the JS coordinated on just over 430 DoD issuances as shown in Table 1-1.

Table 1-1. JCS Coordination of DoD Issuances

Office of primary responsibility	Issuance series number								Total
	1000	2000	3000	4000	5000	6000	7000	8000	
DJS	—	—	—	—	3	—	2	—	5
DOM	8	—	—	4	30	2	8	1	53
J1	102	—	—	2	16	3	2	—	125
J2	—	—	3	1	10	—	—	—	14
J3	1	6	13	1	16	—	—	—	37
J4	8	5	10	35	15	10	1	—	84
J5	4	7	5	1	24	—	—	—	41
J6	—	—	2	13	13	1	—	1	31
J7	2	—	—	—	5	—	—	—	7
J8	1	—	3	2	12	—	2	—	20
LC	1	1	—	—	3	1	—	—	6
OC	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
PA	—	—	—	—	8	—	—	—	8
Total	133	19	36	59	155	17	15	2	432

Note: DJS = Director, JS; DOM = Director of Management; JS, elements of the Office of the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; LC = legal council; OC = Other; PA = public affairs.

Source: Provided by Joint Staff, Directorate of Management, Action Division, Action Assignment and Control Branch.

According to the information in Table 1-1, the J1 and J4 are responsible for about 48 percent of the DoD issuances that were coordinated. The remaining DoD issuances were not coordinated during the time period measured. Subsequent discussions of these issuances will be categorized as "unknown." The unknowns will be included in the following analysis for completeness.

EA delegations are mentioned in 80 DoD issuances. Of these, only 64 have been recently staffed. These include 56 DoD directives and 8 DoD instructions that contain EA delegations. Table 1-2 reflects this split. It also reflects the JS office of primary responsibility, where known. The "unknown" category represents a DoD issuance that was not recently coordinated. As part of our method, we further categorized the EA delegations to those that appear to involve wartime executive agency responsibility (WEAR). We developed this category after reviewing the EA responsibility described in the DoD issuance. We then judged if the responsibilities constituted an essential wartime requirement.

We believe that only 23 DoD issuances, 18 DoD directives and 5 DoD instructions, involve wartime EA matters. Of these, the JS, J4, has coordination lead for five directives and five instructions. This is half of the 20 EAs identified with JS, J4, coordination lead responsibility.

Table 1-2. Executive Agent Delegation in DoD Issuances

Issuance type	JS POC	Issuance series number							
		1000	2000	3000	4000	5000	6000	8000	Grand total
DoDD									
	DOM	1	—	—	—	2	—	1	4
	J1	11	—	—	—	2	—	—	13
	J2	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1
	J3	—	2	6	—	—	—	—	8
	J4	1	1	2	5	1	2	—	12
	J5	—	1	2	—	7	—	—	10
	J6	—	—	0	1	4	—	—	5
	LC	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	2
	OC	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Unknown	—	—	—	2	9	1	—	12
DoDD total		14	5	10	8	27	3	1	68
DoDI									
	J4	—	—	—	5	1	2	—	8
	Unknown	—	—	—	—	2	2	—	4
DoDI total		—	—	—	5	3	4	—	12
Total		14	5	10	13	33	7	1	80

SUMMARY AND REPORT ORGANIZATION

Designating EAs in DoD is a process lacking oversight. The autonomous nature of the OSD staff and the traditional ambivalence about who is assigned EA responsibilities has created the situation that exists today. DoD downsizing has highlighted the need to institutionalize responsibilities to maximize the use of resources.

Chapter 2 focuses on EA responsibilities of direct interest to the JS, J4, specifically those with logistics or mobilization responsibilities.

Chapter 3 reviews other EA taskings for which other JS directorates are primarily responsible but the JS, J4, has a direct interest in the process.

Chapter 4 proposes new EA taskings. The functions recommended for EA status are based on the contents of existing tasks or from a perceived need to clarify responsibilities that are emerging from current doctrine.

Chapter 5 recommends a 38-week program for clarifying EA responsibilities and for making the scope and responsibilities inherent in these EA delegations visible inside and outside DoD.

Chapter 6 summarizes the report.

Chapter 2
Logistics and Mobilization Executive Agent Taskings

In this chapter we review DoD issuances that relate to areas of interest to the JS, J4. We selected DoD directives and DoD instructions in the 4000 to 6000 series plus directives and instructions that involved EA designation and contained "logistics" and "mobilization" in the title. Because the government did not convene a panel of Joint Staff, the services, or Defense agencies to review EA assignments, we determined WEAR on the basis of our review of the DoD issuance and the JS, J4, staff's desire to review logistics and mobilization matters.

EXECUTIVE AGENTS OF INTEREST TO THE JS, J4

JS, J4, is directly interested in 20 EA delegations.[1] Although the data can be divided in other ways, the J4 lead for DoD issuance coordination provided a practical and auditable basis for analysis. Table 2-1 shows the directive number, date, subject, the office of primary responsibility (OPR) or alternative OPR (AOPR), remarks about the issuance, the age as of 1 March 2000, and whether the issuance is considered a WEAR item. The average age of the 12 DoD directives' is 7.7 years. Their ages range from 0.1 years to 17 years. The average age of the eight DoD instructions is 8.9 years. Their ages range from 1.4 to 20.9 years.

DoD Directives

WEAR-RELATED DoDD

Of the 12 listed DoD directives, only the following five are considered wartime related.

1. DoDD 1300.22, "Mortuary Affairs Policy," is a new directive (February 2000) that formalizes responsibilities that were first stated in CJCS Memorandum of Policy (MOP) 16 in May 1990, was further codified in an Acting SECDEF memorandum in March 1991, and subsequently in cluded in JCS Pub 4-06 as joint doctrine in August 1996. DoDD 1300.22 finally formalizes Army EA responsibilities to man and administer the office that develops mortuary affairs joint tactics, techniques, and practices. The directive also requires the Army to maintain an unspecified level of deploy-

---

[1] This number reflects 17 DoD issuances in which the J4 was given the responsibility of leading coordination during the past few years and 3 issuances that were not coordinated or coordinated after data were collected.

able general support mortuary force structure. The directive does not cancel either MOP 16 or the Acting SECDEF's memorandum. We understand that MOPs were replaced by CJCS instructions. In addition, the contents of the Acting SECDEF's memorandum should have been incorporated into the new directive, as appropriate.

Table 2-1. DoD Executive Agent Directives with JS, J4, Coordination Lead Responsibility

DoDD Number	Date	Subject	OPR/ AOPR	Remarks	Age (yrs)	WEAR
1300.22	2/3/00	Mortuary affairs policy	AR		0.1	Yes
2010.9	9/30/88	Mutual logistic support between the United States and governments of eligible countries and NATO subsidiary bodies	OT	No EA designations	11.5	Yes
3216.1	4/17/95	Use of laboratory animals in DoD programs	AR		4.9	No
3235.2	4/20/83	DoD food and nutrition research, development, testing, evaluation, and engineering program	AR	Old, review and update	17.0	No
4120.15	5/2/85	Designating and naming military aerospace vehicles	AF	Old. Does not require EA designation	15.0	No
4400.1	3/18/96	Defense Production Act programs	AF	Is AF EA still appropriate?	3.9	No
4500.9	1/26/89	Transportation and traffic management	AR	Update. All major ref'd DoDDs are OBE	6.2	No
4510.11	10/2/95	DoD transportation engineering	OT/ USTC	Update on next review	4.4	No
4705.1	7/9/92	Management of land-based water resources in support of Joint contingency operations	AR		7.7	Yes
5030.49	1/6/84	DoD Customs inspection program	AR	Needs update	16.3	No
6000.12	4/29/96	Health services operations and readiness	AR	In JCS Coord; AF not designated as EA for blood tranship centers	2.1	Yes
6055.9	7/29/96	DoD Explosives Safety Board and DoD component explosives safety responsibilities	AR		3.6	Yes

Notes: Age of DoDD 4500.9 is though Change 2 dated December 29, 1993; age of DoDD 6000.12 is through Change 1 dated January 20, 1998. OT–Other (EA not specifically identified); AR–Army; AF–Air Force; NA–Navy.

2. DoDD 2010.9, "Mutual Logistic Support Between the United States and Governments of Eligible Countries and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Subsidiary Bodies," although originally targeted toward NATO, was expanded by Public Law 99-661[2], which allowed the United States to give and receive mutual logistics support worldwide. There are some limitations, however. The support is permitted under the countries meet one of the following conditions.

   ◆ Have a defense alliance with the United States, or

   ◆ Permit stationing of U.S. forces or homeporting of U.S. Naval vessels, or

   ◆ Have agreed to prepositioning of U.S. materiel in their country, or

   ◆ Serve as host for U.S. forces in exercises or permit other military operations by U.S. forces in their country.

   The CJCS may negotiate these mutual support arrangements or delegate EA authority to a unified or specified commander who may in turn delegate the EA authority to a sub-unified command. Because of this directive's age (30 Sept. 88), it should be reviewed for currency. In addition, when the CJCS delegates its authority, it should report the delegation to OSD.

3. DoDD 4705.1, "Management of Land-Based Water Resource in Support of Contingency Operations," is clearly a wartime-related delegation as it tasks the Army with broad responsibility that applies to all aspects of land-based water support for the U.S. Armed Forces during contingency operations. Among the Army's tasks is to develop an easily retrievable water resource intelligence database to support commanders of unified commands in their logistics planning and decisions. The directive also tasks the Army to ensure that resources are applied to provide the necessary technology and force structure for remaining abreast of operational plans and force structure. The Army's Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics performs this for the Secretary of the Army.

4. DoDD 6000.12, "Health Services Operations and Readiness," is a multifaceted directive that affects health service infrastructure, policies, and procedures in peace and war. The directive assigns EA responsibility to the Army for the Armed Services Blood Program (ASBP) Office. The responsibility is further delegated to the Army's Surgeon General. The directive also makes U.S. Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM) the DoD single manager for inter-theater patient movement. DoDI 6480.4, designates the Air Force as the EA for Armed Forces blood processing

---

[2] Public Law 99-661, "The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987," November 14, 1986.

laboratories, blood transshipment centers (BTCs), and transportable BTCs (TBTCs). This Air Force EA assignment is not consistent with the contents of DoDD 6000.12. The responsibility for blood matters should be reviewed.

5. DoDD 6055.9 gives the Army the responsibility to administratively support the DoD Explosives Safety Board (DDESB). This directive also designates the Army as the EA in the continental United States (CONUS) for DoD emergency response to transportation mishaps involving ammunition and explosives. The Army is responsible during both peacetime and war. The directive mandates using the Defense Transportation Tracking System (DTTS) to oversee ammunition movements. Responsibilities of the DDESB are reflected in this directive. This responsibility could be included under the Army's responsibility as the single manager for conventional ammunition (DoDD 5160.65).

NON-WEAR-RELATED DODD

The remaining seven DoD directives are considered non-WEAR related.

1. DoDD 3216.1, "Use of Laboratory Animals in DoD Programs," designates the Army as the EA for policies and procedures for DoD's use of laboratory animals. As this is primarily a research and development (R&D) responsibility, it is not WEAR related.

2. DoDD 3235.2, DoD Food and Nutrition Research, Development, Testing, Evaluation, and Engineering Program," designates the Army as the EA for joint service food and nutrition R&D. Because this is an R&D EA designation, it is not WEAR related. Because the directive is old, 17 years, it should be updated.

3. DoDD 4120.15, "Designating and Naming Military Aerospace Vehicles," does not involve wartime matters because it pertains to the naming of military aerospace vehicles. This directive needs to be reviewed and DoD should consider removing the EA responsibility from the directive. According to the OSD Acquisition and Technology (A&T) point of contact (POC), this directive was reviewed in 1999; however, the OSD publications Internet site does not show an update.

4. DoDD 4400.1, "Defense Production Act Programs," delegates EA responsibility for Title III of the Defense Production Act. The EA is responsible for expanding the production capability and supply. Although this EA designation involves prioritizing requirements into DoD's Master Urgency List (MUL), only the designation of a combat commander's MUL indicates that this could be a WEAR item. Because of the production implications of this responsibility, and the changes in DoD procurement over the past decade, Air Force EA for this matter may no longer be appropriate.

5. DoDD 4500.9, "Transportation and Traffic Management," delegates EA authority to the Army for military assistance to safety and traffic. The assistance is for developing the policies and procedures necessary for providing medical emergency helicopter services to civilian communities. We list this function as a non-WEAR directive; however, DoDD 4500.9 is a key policy directive that sets forth the use and authority for many of the transportation-related policies in DoD. The directive needs to be updated to reflect new organizations in place since 1993. Specifically, a SECDEF memorandum cancelled all directives relating to the transportation component commands. This cancellation should have been incorporated into DoDD 5158.4 that documents the responsibilities of USTRANSCOM.

6. DoDD 4510.11, "DoD Transportation Engineering," mentions an executive agent but does not define who that will be. The EA reference occurs where the criteria for financial assistance to railroads is discussed. The EA recommends this assistance when a series of criteria are satisfied. The directive only gives specific responsibilities to USTRANSCOM and the Army. The components have general responsibilities. This implies that USTRANSCOM's Army component, Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC), may be the designated EA. This directive implies that it applies to peacetime CONUS matters. Although these arrangements apply in wartime, they are not considered WEAR related. If the EA designation is still valid, it should be clarified during a routine review.

7. The final non-WEAR directive is DoDD 5030.49, "DoD Customs Inspection Program." Because this directive is nearly 16.5 years old, it should be updated to reflect current practice. We did not categorize the directive as WEAR related because it is a peacetime function that extends to wartime. This function could be WEAR related; however, because it has not been reviewed over time, we included it in the non-WEAR category.

DoD Instructions

Table 2-2 shows that 8 DoD instructions are of interest to the JS, J4, that designate an EA. DoD's policy is that DoD directives designate an EA or include the authority for EA designation in a DoD instruction. Four of the 8 DoD instructions do not reflect an authorizing DoD directive. Five are considered WEAR-related items. The remaining three are not.

Table 2-2. DoD Executive Agent Instructions with JS, J4, Coordination Lead Responsibility

DoDI Number	Date	Subject	OPR/ AOPR	Remarks	Age (yrs)	WEAR
4000.19	8/9/95	Interservice and intragovernmental support	OT/UNK		4.5	Yes
4140.50	12/9/82	Management of DoD locomotives	AR	Needs update	17.4	No
4150.7	4/22/96	DoD pest management program	AR		3.8	Yes
4500.45	4/24/84	DoD Transportation Policy Council	OT/JDA	Eliminate	16.0	No
4715.2	5/3/96	DoD regional environmental coordination	OT/AR, AF, NA	CONUS only	3.8	No
5160.67	7/6/79	Defense freight railway interchange fleet	AR	Needs update	20.9	Yes
6000.11	9/9/98	Medical regulating	OT/ USTC		1.4	Yes
6480.4	8/5/96	Armed Services Blood Program operational procedures	OT/AR, AF	AF Armed Svcs blood proc labs, BTC, & trans- portable BTCs	3.5	Yes

Note: OT–Other (EA not specifically identified); AR–Army; AF–Air Force; NA–Navy; UNK–unknown.

WEAR-RELATED DoDI

We consider the following five DoD instructions WEAR related.

1. DoDI 4000.19, "Interservice and Intragovernmental Support," permits assigning EA responsibilities. These responsibilities are related to Joint Interservice Regional Support Groups (JIRSGs) in CONUS and abroad. Where an EA exists, the EA is responsible for coordinating common support among the governmental participants in the respective region. Because these responsibilities could have wartime application, we considered them as WEAR. This instruction identifies the current JIRSG EAs as well as the functions that can be included in the support. The instruction's referenced DoD directives do not include the authority to designate EAs.

2. DoDI 4150.7 designates the Army as the EA for the DoD Pest Management Control Board. We considered this a WEAR item because of the need for battlefield sanitation during conflicts. DoDD 4715.1 authorizes this EA, however, this instruction does not include the directive as a reference.

3. DoDI 5160.67, "Defense Freight Railway Interchange Fleet (DFRIF)," is nearly 21 years old. The instruction's designation of the MTMC as the Army's EA for managing the DFRIF must be reviewed. This instruction refers to DoDD 5160.53 as its source authority. However, DoDD 5160.53 was cancelled by the SECDEF memorandum that established

USTRANSCOM. Because the DFRIF supports DoD power projection capabilities, we considered it a WEAR item.

This instruction should be cancelled because the authority it contains is an implied part of DoDD 5158.4, "United States Transportation Command." The authoritative parts of DoDI 5160.67 are covered in detail in DoD 4500.9-R, 11 April 1997. This instruction is a classic example of the limitations of managing the issuances.

4. DoDI 6000.11, "Medical Regulating," names the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs (ASD (HA)) as the EA for patient affairs and it reaffirms the role of USTRANSCOM as the single manager for patient regulation. This EA designation is not in the primary reference, DoDD 6000.12, which only designates the Army the EA responsibility for the ASBP. We considered this instruction WEAR because of its medical regulating function.

5. DoDI 6480.4, "Armed Services Blood Program (ASBP) Operational Procedures," contains the operational procedures of the ASBP. This instruction designates the Air Force as the EA for ASBP laboratories, BTCs, and transportable BTCs. DoDD 6000.12 does not give the authority to designate an EA for these functions.

NON-WEAR-RELATED DODI

We did not consider the following three DoD instructions WEAR related.

1. DoDI 4140.50 describes managing and procuring railroad locomotives for DoD. The Army was designated as the EA for this program in 1982, thus, the EA designation is quite old. In addition, no authorizing DoDD exists. We did not consider this a WEAR item because a deployable railroad-equipped force structure doesn't exist and DoD locomotives generally are associated with local installation operations. This DoDI should be reviewed for relevance.

2. DoDI 4500.45, "The Transportation Policy Council," names the Joint Deployment Agency as the JCS EA to the Transportation Policy Council. This instruction references cancelled DoDD 4540.6. Also, the Joint Deployment Agency was disestablished with the advent of USTRANSCOM. This instruction should be eliminated because it is old and processes have changed during the past 16 years.

3. DoDI 4715.2 implements CONUS environmental policies. Its EA designation is supported by a DoDD and it only applies to CONUS. Consequently, we do not consider it a WEAR item.

SUMMARY

Of the nearly 600 DoD directives, the number of EA designations of interest to the JS, J4, is relatively small—20. Of these, only five of the directives affect WEAR functions. The directives are for mortuary affairs, mutual logistics support, land-based water resources for joint operations, the Armed Forces Blood Program, and explosive safety.

The 8 DoDIs of interest to the J4 are among the nearly 327 that are active. Five instructions address WEAR items, interservice and intergovernmental support, pest management, the DFRIF, medical regulating, and blood laboratories and BTCs. In some cases, the EA designations of these instructions do not have supporting directive authority. The defense rail instructions (DoDI 4140.50 and DoDI 5160.67) should be reviewed for cancellation. Their age, the formation of USTRANSCOM, and the contents of DoDD 4500.9 and its supporting publications make them unnecessary. Similarly, DoDI-4500.45 should be cancelled because it is out of date and processes have changed.

The JS, J4, DoD issuances of interest regarding EA responsibilities reflect delegation of authority that might better be included in another support category, such as administrative agent, or a new category, such as management agent. In many instances, DoD issuances use the term EA only to confer funding and administrative responsibility. Although this designation meets the definition of an EA, the distinction between true operational responsibilities and basic administration oversight dilutes the EA designation.

Chapter 3
Other Executive Agent Taskings

Chapter 2 identified the EA designations that are central to JS, J4. This chapter describes other EA designations that we believe are of interest to JS, J4, but for which other JS directorates have lead responsibility or the responsible office is not known. The average age of these issuances is 9.6 years, ranging from 2.1 to 19.4 years. As was evident with the ages of EA in Chapter 2, these EA issuances also beyond the 5-year review guideline, in fact 10 of the 13 are 5.5 years and older.

ANALYSIS

The issuances in Table 3-1, while of interest to the JS, J4, do not directly affect logistics matters for forces in offensive or defensive operations. Subjects include enemy prisoners of war, noncombatant evacuation of citizens and aliens, industrial hygiene and chemical research and development, and industrial security. All are considered WEAR items except for the three noted.

1. DoDD 1325.4, "Confinement of Military Prisoners and Administration of Military Correctional Programs and Facilities," gives the Army EA responsibilities for the Level III corrections. The responsibilities include sentences of more than 5 years for soldiers or more than 30 days for officers and cadets. The administrative size and extent of this responsibility is not known. This directive was recently updated. It is not WEAR related.

2. DoDD 2310.1, "DoD Program for Enemy Prisoners of War (EPW) and Other Detainees," tasks the Secretary of the Army to administer the EPW Detainee Program. The task includes legal, information, and advisory assistance to the Joint Staff and the services. The task also includes liaison, coordination, accounting, legal, and technical support for EPW operations in CONUS and abroad. There may be force structure implications in terms of staff support and actual unit requirements for these responsibilities.

3. Personnel recovery EA delegation to the Air Force as contained in DoDD 2310.2 extends to the development of doctrine, tactics, and techniques; coordination with commanders of combatant commands; and advocacy for programming. This EA responsibility does not extend to force structure of the services or the (U.S. Special Operations Command [USSOCOM]). This EA delegation might need to be reviewed because the recent use of Special Operations Forces (SOF) to recover personnel.

Table 3-1. Other Joint Staff Executive Agent Delegations of J4 Interest

Number	Date	Subject	OPR/ AOPR	Remarks	Age (Yrs)	WEAR
DoDD 1325.4	9/28/99	Confinement of military prisoners and administration of military correctional programs and facilities	AR		0.5	No
DoDD 2310.1	8/18/94	DoD Program for enemy prisoners of war (EPOW) and other detainees (short title: DoD Enemy POW Detainee Program)	AR		5.5	Yes
DoDD 2310.2	6/30/97	Personnel recovery (PR)	AF		2.6	Yes
DoDD 3025.14	11/5/90	Protection and evacuation of U.S. citizens and designated aliens in danger areas abroad (short title: Noncombatant evacuation operations)	AR		7.7	Yes
DoDD 3150.5	3/24/87	DoD response to improvised nuclear device (IND) incidents	OT/ ASD ISA	WMD responsibilities dictate review	13.0	Yes
DoDD 3150.6	2/3/88	United States Nuclear Command and Control System support staff	OT/ SECDEF	Requires review. Is old	12.2	Yes
DoDD 5100.41	5/1/91	Executive agent responsibilities for the National Communications System (NCS)	OT/ SECDEF, DISA	Update to reflect DISA	8.9	Yes
DoDD 5105.19	6/25/91	Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA)	OT/ DISA	CJCS reports to SECDEF on DISAs responsiveness & readiness to support operating forces	8.7	Yes
DoDD 5160.5	5/1/85	Responsibilities for research, development, and acquisition of chemical weapons and chemical and biological defense	AR	Needs update	15.0	Yes
DoDD 5160.54	1/20/98	Critical Asset Assurance Program (CAAP)	AR		2.1	Yes
DoDD 5220.22	12/8/80	DoD Industrial Security Program (NISP)	OT/ SECDEF	Needs update	19.4	No
DoDD 6050.16	9/20/91	DoD Policy for establishing and implementing environmental standards at overseas installations	OT/ ASD P&L	Update. CINCs must ID in OPLANS	8.5	Yes
DoDI 6055.5	1/10/89	Industrial hygiene and occupational health	Unknown	Does not apply to wartime operations	3.7	No

4. DoDD 3025.14 delegates the Secretary of the Army as the EA for DoD evacuees from danger areas abroad. This responsibility includes establishing a Joint Reception Coordination Center when and if required. Army responsibilities are fairly broad because the Army needs to be able to keep all federal agencies informed about all aspects of the evacuation operation.

5. DoDD 3150.5, "DoD Response to Improvised Nuclear Device (IND) Incidents," must be updated. New forces and concepts exist for responding to weapons of mass destruction (WMD). In addition, the services are required to respond to two referenced documents that are 15 and 17 years

old. Changes in the world threat, and the way the current directive is structured, warrant immediate and through review to incorporate current policy and practices. This directive may be related to a secret directive, DoDD-S-5210.36, "Provision of DoD Sensitive Support to DoD Components and Other Departments and Agencies of the U.S. Government (U)," which is current through Change 2, dated January 5, 1998.

6. DoDD 3150.6 formalizes the contents of National Security Decision Directive, "United States Nuclear Weapons Command and Control," August 21, 1987, and the public law that designates the authority of the SECDEF. This directive designates the SECDEF as the EA for Nuclear Command and Control. This directive is 12 years old; it should be reviewed and re-written to make it conform with newer directives.

7. The SECDEF also is designated as the EA for the National Communications System in DoDD 5100.41 as provided for in Executive orders.[1] This responsibility is similar to that of DoDD 3150.6, but broader in scope. This directive should be revised to reflect the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) as the Defense combat support agency that carries out day-to-day responsibilities for the SECDEF.

8. DoDD 5105.19 established DISA. Given the changes in information technology during the past 9 years, this directive should be reviewed for accuracy.

9. DoD Directive 5160.5, "Responsibilities for Research, Development, and Acquisition of Chemical Weapons and Chemical and Biological Defense," is 15 years old. Given the prominence and concern about WMD and chemical warfare, this directive needs to be updated.

10. DoDD 5160.54, "Critical Asset Assurance Program (CAAP), is relatively new. The directive tasks the Secretary of the Army to identify critical assets as nominated by the components. In many ways, this function appears similar to the homeland defense process of the 1960s. CAAP could encompass the Air Force Title III efforts mentioned in DoDD 4000.1, described in Chapter 2.

11. The DoD Industrial Security Program (NISP) directive (DoDD 5220.22) is nearly 20 years old. The nation's industrial base has been radically altered during the past two decades. The changing nature of the country's infrastructure and new manufacturing concepts warrant a timely review of this directive. We do not consider it a WEAR-related item.

---

[1] Executive Order 12472, "Assignment of National Emergency Preparedness Telecommunications Functions," April 3, 1984, and Executive Order 12382, "President's National Security Telecommunications Advisory Committee," September 13, 1982.

12. DoDD-6050.16 establishes environmental standards at overseas installations. The directive authorizes a DoD EA for a host nation. In places where U.S. forces are permanently stationed abroad, the EA responsibilities are fixed; for wartime operations, combatant commanders must designate the EA in the operations plans (OPLANs). There should be a means to document these delegations at OSD level.

13. DoDI-6055.5, "Industrial Hygiene and Occupational Health," designates the Secretary of the Navy as the EA for industrial hygiene and occupational health. The instruction seems focused on CONUS operations in a major manufacturing setting. We do not consider this WEAR related.

SUMMARY

As is evident from Table 3-1, in general the EA delegations are quite old. They should be reviewed for continued relevance and updated to reflect many of the realignments caused by the current size of the DoD. Particular attention to DoDD 3150.5, "DoD Response to Improvised Nuclear Device (IND) Incidents," is needed because of increased awareness of terrorism and the use of WMD. The Joint Staff should review this directive along with DoDD-S-5210.36, "Provision of DoD Sensitive Support to DoD Components and Other Departments and Agencies of the U.S. Government (U)," for redundancy.

Chapter 4
Proposed Executive Agent Delegations

Thus far, we have documented and reviewed existing EA delegations. In this chapter, we identify logistics-related functional areas for which EA delegations may make sense and do not adversely affect traditional service Title 10 responsibilities. Our recommendations are based on the existing EA delegations and those that could facilitate joint operational integration.

FUNCTIONAL AREAS OF INTEREST

As was demonstrated in previous chapters, few EA delegations have a logistics focus. In the six logistics functional areas—supply, maintenance, transportation, general engineering, health services, and services—we documented in Chapter 2, some EA responsibilities are delegated. Two examples are explosive ordnance disposal (Navy) and mortuary affairs (Army). Until recently, no DoDD documented the Army's EA responsibility for mortuary affairs. Formally documenting this responsibility took nearly 9 years. DoDD 1300.22 did not cancel the documents that originally gave the Army its EA responsibilities.

Table 4-1 shows the six logistics functional areas described in Joint Publication 4-0. The sub-functions are those used by the Marine Corps to define its responsibilities for tactical logistics. The Marine Corps sub-functions are illustrative of the capabilities the services are expected to provide for themselves or others during tactical operations. With the DoD's increasing emphasis on Joint operations, we believe that the EA designation is warranted for the four functions highlighted in Table 4-1.

The communications sub-function is already the Army's responsibility as delegated by the ASD C3I. This EA delegation should be formalized in a DoDD.

Other EA delegations may be warranted for bridging, intermodal materiel-handling equipment, and medical capability oversight. Currently, the Army and Navy Seabees are the largest users of bridging and the need is growing. New battlefield distribution concepts require a common effort to rationalize intermodal materiel-handling equipment. The fragmentation of medical force structure requires a single entity to oversee requirements and capabilities.

Table 4-1. JCS Logistics Functional Areas and Sub-Functions

Supply Systems	Maintenance	Transportation
• Requirement determination • Procurement • Storage • Distribution • Salvage • Disposal	• Inspection & classification • Service, adjustment, & tuning • Testing & calibration • Repair • Modification • Rebuild & overhaul • Reclamation • Recovery & evacuation	• Embarkation • Landing support • Port & terminal operations • Motor transport • Air delivery • Freight & passenger movement • Materiel-handling equipment
General Engineering	Health Services	Miscellaneous Services
• Engineer reconnaissance • Horizontal & vertical construction • Facilities maintenance • Demolition & obstacle removal • Explosive ordnance disposal • Bridging	• Health maintenance • Casualty collection • Casualty treatment • Temporary casualty holding • Casualty evacuation	• Command services • Personnel administration • Religious ministry • Financial management • Communications • Billeting • Messing • Band • Morale, welfare, and recreation • CSS services • Disbursing • Postal • Exchange • Security support • Legal civil affairs

Bridging

During the past decade, the services have become more aware of the importance of bridging. Bridging was essential during humanitarian operations in Somalia and peacekeeping operations in Bosnia. These operations used fixed and floating bridge material, mainly from the Army. As a commodity, bridging is a fungible product that can benefit from central management, oversight, and responsibility. There is concern about the availability, completeness, and maintenance of bridging material. Over time, replenishing and replacing bridge components has lagged behind requirements. Consequently, less material is available to meet requirements.

The EA would help determine the requirement by expanding contact with combatant commanders. The EA would keep abreast of service programs, the status of operational projects, and the maintenance of all DoD bridge assets. In effect, the EA would become a "one-stop" contact that would coordinate the supply of and understand the life cycle of bridges in DoD. The EA also would remain abreast of complementary programs, such as modular floating causeways, which can be used to meet some floating bridge requirements. Also, we envision that the EA will be required to be informed about bridge assets worldwide.

Besides traditional bridging materials, Army and Navy floating causeways in the DoD inventory can be used as floating bridging, if required. Under the correct circumstances, on coasts, rivers, canals, or waterways, causeway sections can significantly augment standard float bridge capability. Besides the services, allied forces have significant bridge capability, both fixed and floating that can augment U.S. inventories under certain circumstances. The EA for bridging would be responsible for overseeing *all* DoD bridging materials and forces, categorizing the capability of the assets, and being a resource for combatant commanders and their service component commanders. The EA also would be responsible for intelligence about the number, type, and capability of bridging available from or possessed by allies or third countries.

Intermodal Materiel-Handling Equipment

The current emphasis on focused logistics, velocity management, and a responsive supply chain suggests that an EA for intermodal materiel- and container-handling equipment (MHE/CHE) should be delegated. This EA would join aspects of distribution from the supply systems functions listed in Table 4-1 with the materiel-handling equipment from the transportation function. The intent is to make the EA responsible for the end-to-end integration, rationalization, and application of MHE/CHE among the services. To meet this objective, the EA will ensure that each service defines its requirements and what support it expects from the other services.

Ideally, a synergy will develop among the services as the distribution channels are developed. For example, an Army truck that delivers ammunition to an expeditionary airfield would be able to unload at the destination just as it would if the customer were an Army ammunition transfer point. In this instance, the integration may enable both the Air Force and the Army to reduce the number or optimize the capability of required MHE/CHE. Ideally, this synergy will result in more precise delivery quantities and a much simpler delivery process. This effort also should reduce pipeline times and perhaps organization size or designs.

Communications

As we mentioned in Chapter 3, the ASD C3I designated the Army as the EA for tactical switch networks. The precepts of precision logistics rely on automation to achieve the synergies required to defeat an enemy. This synergy depends fully

integrating all aspects of combat power from the combat unit to its timely and precise logistics support. The gap between the communications capabilities of combat forces and support forces is an ongoing issue that has not been resolved. The JCS Joint Vision expects forces to be more integrated during future joint operations. This integration will take place simultaneously with an attempt to provide "just enough" support. The result will be a smaller force footprint in the area of operations (AO). Forces will be modular, resulting in more heterogeneous command, control, and support. DoD has not yet defined the data required to resolve this issue.

Medical Capability Oversight

The joint medical community is characterized by fragmented responsibilities for overseeing medical capabilities. This fragmentation argues for an EA or single manager overseeing end-to-end medical capabilities, including patient regulation and casualty evacuation. Although DoDD 6000.12 identifies the Commander in Chief, U.S. Transportation Command (CINCTRANS), as the single manager for patient movement and regulating, and designates the Army as the EA for the ASBPO, no entity has the overall responsible for ensuring that DoD has the means to adequately care for casualties from military operations.

We believe that this EA designation would extend to full oversight and responsibility for all aspects of medical readiness, including patient regulation and casualty evacuation with emphasis on hospital beds, both deployable in the theater of operations and in the CONUS. Part of the EA's mandate would be to quantify the qualitative or quantitative differences between hospital bed requirements among the services. The EA would focus on the types and numbers of resources needed by the respective service populations at risk, taking into account service-specific requirements for treatment or medical specialties.

The existing formal EA and single manager designations would be reviewed for continuation. However, the designations, such as veterinary responsibilities (Army), medical software development (Navy), and the BTC (Air Force), that are not formally documented in DoD directives must be reviewed.

In addition, the authorization for the Defense Medical Standardization Board (DMSB) does not follow administratively from the directives and instructions that are cited as authorization documents. DoDD 6000.12 does not reference DoDI 6430.2, which enumerates the authority of the DMSB. As a practical matter, the administrative trail that links old and new issuances is not consistent. For example, DoDI 6430.2 indicates that it replaces DoDD 6430.2, which was cancelled by DoDD 6000.12. This is not the case. Similarly, the DMSB is mentioned in DoDD 6000.12 but neither the body of the directive nor its references indicate that DoDI 6430.2 relates to the DMSB or that DoDD 6430.2 was cancelled or replaced by the corresponding DoDI.

Given the nature of this proposed EA designation, we believe that the former commander in chief (CINC) of Atlantic Command (CINCACOM), now USJFCOM, should be designated as the EA for overseeing medical capability. As a supporting CINC, USJCOM provides forces to other combatant commanders and is concerned about the adequacy of force structure and force readiness. As EA, USJFCOM would be able to integrate the operational planning and force programming to ensure closer coordination among the services. It also will facilitate coordinating bed availability beyond facilities provided by DoD and the Veterans Administration.

SUMMARY

We suggest a few functions for which new EA responsibilities are warranted. These functions include bridging, intermodal materiel handling, communications, and medical capability oversight.

These functions offer significant opportunity for optimization and standardization. The functions provide "purple" services that services require, but which services may not have as their top priority. The USJFCOM recently indicated that Joint Vision 2010 needs stronger input from CINCs by positing that "it is time for unified commanders in chief to stake out maybe half a dozen military capability areas and establish that, in these narrow areas, joint requirements supersede service requirements."[1] He mentioned six areas in which the CINCs would probably agree but only one was related to logistics—strategic mobility and deployment. The proposed initiatives would directly and indirectly affect strategic mobility and deployment by refining requirements and ensuring that these functions provide the needed logistics capabilities or alternative means for satisfying the requirement. Since then, JFCOM has been designated as the deployment process owner.

---

[1] Garamone, J. "Joint Vision 2010 Needs for Stronger CinC Voice, Gehman Says," American Forces Press Service, Washington, DC, March 17, 2000.

Chapter 5
A Suggested Plan for Executive Agent Process Improvement

INTRODUCTION

We've indicated the extent of the problems of delegating EAs. In this chapter, we outline the steps for controlling and strengthening the EA process. This work is essential if the DoD is to completely understand the identified responsibilities of each of the Services and Defense Combat Support Agencies. This work also will make the taskings visible to everyone so that decisions can be made with full understanding of delegated responsibilities, their extent, to whom they apply, and when they are in effect.

THE PLAN

To rationalize EA responsibilities throughout the DoD, the DoD issuance system must be systematically revamped. This effort must focus on the review of all issuances to ensure they will continue to be applicable. Priority should be placed on the issuances that require a service, combatant command, or Defense combat support agency to perform specific responsibilities, such as executive agent, lead agent, agent, lead service, or administrative agent.

The OSD Director of Management should direct the overall effort. The Joint Staff, Director of Management, will focus the efforts of the Joint Staff. OSD PSA must be directly involved because existing administrative procedures give each PSA latitude when delegating responsibilities but the procedures do not provide enough control over the process for managing effectively.

To bring the issuance process under control, existing issuances (directives, instructions, and other DoD material) must be initially validated. This will require a 4-phase plan as described below.

Phase 1: Preparation—4 Weeks

PSA and service POCs are identified and briefed on the project's objective, goals, and timelines. The POCs also will be given access to the operational database. During this time, OSD, service, and CINC POCs will identify the OPR and the responsible individual (RI) for each DoD issuance. At the end of the 4 weeks, the POCs will have reached consensus about the proper OPR and RI. This information will be entered into the database of record. By successfully completing phase

1, the process can move to phase 2. Phase I should be "web enabled" to facilitate coordination.

Phase 2: Data Validation and Cleansing—6 Weeks

Phase 2 builds on the preparation begun during phase 1. During this phase, the existing DoD issuances, PSA memorandums, policy statements, etc. that direct services, combat support agencies, CINCs, or others to perform specific functions or be responsible for administration or management of offices, boards, commissions, etc will be reviewed. The review will focus on the categories of responsibilities cited in the database used during phase 1. In addition, OPR/RI will develop keywords that accurately describe the contents of the specific DoD issuance or other document in the database. At the end of the 6 weeks, the database should reflect the proper OPR and RI, the keywords should be accurate, and preliminary decisions about which items require changing should be made and the extent of the change identified.

Concurrent with the cleansing of data, the services, the combatant commands, and DSAs will review the taskings that they believe are generated from sources outside their control. The functions or responsibilities that use manpower and physical or fiscal resources will be given priority. Where appropriate the percentage of the imposed workload that supports activities beyond the provider's organization will be identified. If the support is included as part of an interservice support agreement, the agreement number, title, the level of effort, and reimbursable status will be provided.

During this phase, participants must incorporate the tenets of emerging doctrine and JCS Joint Vision 2020.

Phase 3: Program Review—2 Weeks

After phases 1 and 2 are complete, all input will be reviewed. The review panel should include decision makers from the services, DSAs, the CINCs, and the Joint Staff. For this effort, we envision that CINC liaison officers (LNOs) will represent their combatant commands. If CINC representation is not possible, the JS should represent the CINCs. The review will focus on the content of the database. The objectives of the review are

◆ validate responsibilities,

◆ identify OPR and RI for all database records,

◆ determine if the responsibility is WEAR related,

◆ clearly delineate the extent of delegated responsibilities,

◆ identify DoD issuances that must be updated and develop a priority order for the updates, and

◆ recommend new EAs as required.

At the end of phase 3, a consensus about the content of the database should be reached. As a result, the database will reflect a common view of delegated responsibilities as well as the extent of the responsibilities. The database will show the recommended changes to the documents and the relative importance of the changes. The review panel will judge the importance of the changes as high, medium, or low. The review panel will recommend different suspense periods for each of the three rankings to correct the problems.

At the end of phase 3, the database will be made available for review using the Internet.

Phase 4: Implementation and Continuous Improvement—26 Weeks

During phase 4, the recommendations developed in phase 3 will be implemented. The intent is to work on the DoD issuances according to their importance, from high to low. However, items with a lower importance that can be "fixed" with little effort will be fixed sooner. Th implementation of the recommendations is allotted 26 weeks. As a practical matter, this phase begins the long-term process improvement. The goal at the end of phase 4 should be to have all high-importance directives reviewed, validated, and updated. Goals for the medium- and low-importance items should be 60 and 40 percent, respectively.

Throughout this phase, focus must be placed on rapid staffing to ensure that required changes are incorporated where needed. By using the Internet, the panel should achieve the ambitious timeline set for this phase. This process can only be successful by quickly fixing identified problems.

OTHER REQUIREMENTS

As part of this plan, the DoD must institute policies that change the DoD issuance process. The policies will require issuing a new DoDD regarding EA and other delegations. This directive will state the new policy, fix responsibilities at the OSD level, and suggest the level of oversight. This directive must contain at least the following:

◆ Policy about the designation of executive agents and other unique designations, such as single manager, lead agent, executive manager, by DoD, combatant commanders, and the services

◆ Guidance about the frequency and content of the reporting of EA and other unique responsibilities to OSD

- ◆ Responsibilities of OSD, the Joint Staff, services, and others about the management and use of EA or other delegation

- ◆ Use of an Internet-based data repository.

A draft of a potential EA directive is in Appendix D.

RESULTS

By following the 4-phase process described above and instituting a DoDD, the DoD will have an accurate and comprehensive catalogue of responsibilities conferred by DoD issuances. By involving the services, CINCs, and PSAs, the panel should be able to identify those responsibilities that are invalid. The resulting catalogue will document OSD-directed responsibilities and the appropriate RI and OPR. If other responsibilities are identified in the database, these will reflect the OSD POC along with the responsible field activity.

In OSD, a procedure and processes will be in place to manage and oversee the DoD issuance system. Involving OSD during the 4-phases will ensure that PSAs are aware of their individual mandates while simultaneously applying needed focus. The resulting system will enable DoD to avoid duplicative efforts and misunderstandings about responsibilities.

SUMMARY

The proposed plan will require 12 weeks of concentrated activity to define and validate requirements and fix responsibilities. The remaining 26 weeks will be used for the changes needed for DoD to fully assimilate the process. The new DoD directive will redefine the responsibilities that can be delegated and include the provisions of how to do that.

Chapter 6
Conclusions and Recommendation

CONCLUSIONS

The state of EA delegation in the DoD requires the process for delegating responsibilities be managed. By managing the process, expectations about organizational responsibilities will be defined clearly.

This effort must begin with a top down review of EA and other delegations. The review must validate the "legality of the issuance," the responsibility, the supporting authorities, the responsible parties, and the expected outcome. Although this effort must begin at the OSD level, ultimately, each combatant command and military service must perform the same review. When the review is finished, responsibilities will be clearly delineated and fixed. The review will result in quantifiable and auditable requirements. This goal requires a new DoD directive that is focused solely on delegated responsibilities of EAs and others. A proposed first draft is in Appendix D.

OSD also must review its administrative processes to gain insight into the directive-type memorandums issued by the PSAs. Equally important is reviewing old directive-type memorandums (such as those listed in Appendix C, Table C-3) for continued applicability. If they are no longer applicable, the memorandums should be cancelled. If they are still applicable, they should be incorporated into the DoD issuance system.

Specifically, we conclude:

◆ The OSD must closely manage the assignment of specific titled responsibilities, such as those of EA and others.

After reviewing the policies that govern the process for DoD issuances, we believe that oversight of the process must be improved. The standard 5-year review cycle is not rigorously followed. Often, updates are cosmetic. The Goldwater-Nichols law changed many processes in the DoD, yet many DoD issuances predate that law.

Similarly, in many reorganizations in the DoD responsible offices shift among the OSD PSAs. Also, downsizing has reduced the size of the OSD staff, which resulted in the retirement or transfer of many listed POCs in OSD and the services. The revised process should include the means for remaining abreast of these organizational actions.

The program listed in Chapter 5 is a means to "kick start" this review and make the DoD issuance program an essential element in OSD's information transformation. Visible, accurate, and unambiguous identification of responsibilities will minimize or preclude redundant efforts.

◆ The JS, J4, should begin updating the DoD issuances for which JS is responsible for leading the coordination and the issuance is considered related to wartime. Chapter 2 shows that a relatively small number of issuances designate EA. These should be the first to be updated. Other issuances of J4 interest that reflect other responsibilities are listed in Appendix B. These issuances should be updated second.

◆ The Director, JS, should review the issuances listed in Chapter 3 that relate to wartime and encompass EA responsibility. Those that involve matters related to terrorism should be reviewed for consistency with current counterterrorism and weapons of mass destruction initiatives.

◆ The Director, JS, should review the four proposed new EA designations. Three are the responsibility of JS, J4. The other is the responsibility of JS, J6.

RECOMMENDATION

The misconceptions about EA responsibilities must end. The Joint Staff must work with OSD to review existing EA delegations, recommend those that must be updated, and review other delegations for accuracy and need. We believe that a DoD issuance about delegating specific responsibility is essential. This must be coupled with a concentrated and comprehensive review of all delegated responsibilities in the DoD. This is essential if the precepts and roles envisioned in the CJCS's Joint Vision is to become a reality.

Appendix A
Non-Specific DoD Issuances of Interest to OJCS, J4

Table A-1 reflects current DoD directives with non-specific taskings for which the JS, J4, is the JS coordination lead. The highlighted directives are those that should be given priority for review to determine if they should be retained or updated. The highlighted items are more than 10 years old. Those between 5 and 10 years of age should be second priority. Table A-2 reflects current DoD instructions for which the JS, J4, is the joint staff coordination lead. As is the case in Table A-1, the highlighted items are more than 10 years old and should be reviewed.

Table A-1. DoD Directives of JS, J4, Interest Without Specific Taskings

DoDD Number*	Date	Subject
1000.3	3/29/79	Safety and occupational health policy for the Department of Defense
1225.6	11/2/92	Equipping the Reserve forces
1225.7	3/18/96	Reserve component facilities programs and unit stationing
1235.10	7/1/95	Activation, mobilization, and demobilization of the ready reserve
1400.31	4/28/95	DoD civilian work force contingency and emergency planning and execution
2010.8	11/12/86	Department of Defense policy for NATO logistics
2205.2	10/6/94	Humanitarian and civic assistance provided in conjunction with military operations
3005.7	5/30/85	Emergency requirements, allocations, priorities, and permits for DoD use of domestic civil transportation
3224.3	2/17/89	Physical security equipment: Assignment of responsibility for research, development, testing, evaluation, production, procurement, deployment, and support
3100.5	3/16/87	Department of Defense Offshore Military Activities Program
C-3100.6	8/10/78	Continental United States support of United States-Federal Republic of Germany logistic programs
C-3100.7	6/24/80	United States–Federal Republic of Germany logistic planning
3110.6	4/25/94	War Reserve Materiel Policy
3224.3	2/17/89	Physical security equipment: Assignment of responsibility for research, development, testing, evaluation, production, procurement, deployment, and support
4140.1	1/4/93	Materiel Management Policy
4140.25	4/20/99	DoD Bulk Petroleum Management Policy
4140.58	10/21/93	National Guard and Reserve Equipment Report

Table A-1. DoD Directives of JS, J4, Interest Without Specific Taskings
(Continued)

DoDD Number	Date	Subject
4151.18	8/12/92	Maintenance of military materiel
4270.36	5/17/97	DoD emergency, contingency, and other unprogrammed construction projects
4500.34	4/10/86	DoD Personal Property Shipment and Storage Program
4500.17	1/16/69	Proceedings before transportation regulatory bodies
4500.36	4/10/85	Management, acquisition, and use of motor vehicles
4500.43	10/28/96	Operational support airlift
4500.56	3/2/97	DoD policy on the use of government aircraft and air travel
4515.15	10/15/90	Issuance of military emergency travel warrant
4700.4	1/24/89	Natural Resources Management Program
5030.8	9/24/76	Office of the Coordinator for Ship Repair and Conversion for the Department of Defense and the Department of Commerce
5030.41	6/1/77	Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Prevention and Contingency Program
5100.46	12/4/75	Foreign disaster relief
5105.22	12/6/88	Defense Logistics Agency
5105.33	11/25/87	Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute
5105.55	11/9/90	Defense Commissary Agency
5128.32	11/7/90	Defense Depot Maintenance Council
5136.1	5/27/94	Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs
5136.11	10/26/92	Defense Medical Programs Activity
6025.13	7/20/95	Clinical Quality Management Program in the Military Health Services System
6420.1	9/30/96	Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center
6490.1	10/1/97	Mental health evaluations of members of the Armed Forces
6490.2	8/30/97	Joint medical surveillance
7230.8	2/16/95	Leases and demonstrations of DoD equipment

*Highlighted directive numbers indicate directives that are more than 10 years old.

Table A-2. DoD Instructions of JS, J4, Interest without Specific Taskings

DoDI Number*	Date	Subject
1322.24	12/20/95	Military medical readiness skills training
2205.3	1/27/95	Implementing Procedures for the Humanitarian and Civic Assistance Program
3030.2	5/24/83	Community planning and impact assistance
3110.5	9/14/90	Material condition reporting for mission-essential systems and equipment
4170.10	8/8/91	Energy management policy
4500.17	1/16/69	Proceedings before transportation regulatory bodies
4500.50	8/28/86	Overseas areas exempt from prohibition on shipment of foreign-made privately owned vehicles at government expense
4500.55	10/25/95	Civil Reserve air fleet carrier commercial access to military installations for non-DoD operations
4715.10	4/24/96	Environmental education, training, and career development
4715.3	5/3/96	Environmental Conservation Program
4715.4	6/18/96	Pollution prevention
4715.5	4/22/96	Management of environmental compliance at overseas installations
4715.6	4/24/96	Environmental compliance
4715.7	4/22/96	Environmental Restoration Program
4715.9	5/3/96	Environmental planning and analysis
5128.33	8/16/91	Defense Materiel Management Board
6055.1	10/26/84	DoD Occupational Safety and Health Program

*Highlighted instruction numbers indicate directives that are more than 10 years old.

Appendix B
Non-EA Support Responsibilities of JS, J4, Interest

Table B-1 reflects DoD issuances, for which the JS, J4, is the lead for staffing, that do not involve EA designations. Of the seven issuances, five relate to WEAR. All seven documents are at or beyond their normal 5-year review cycle. The two highlighted items are at least 10 years old; they must be reviewed and updated immediately.

Table B-1. DoD Issuances with Support Responsibilities Beyond Executive Agency

Number*	Date	Subject	EA	SVC	Fill2	SVC1	Age	WEAR	POC2
DoDD 2010.5	6/24/92	DoD participation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure Program	ASpt	OT	Multiple responsi-bilities	ACOM, EUCOM	7.7	No	J4/ILED
DoDD 4270.34	10/19/82	Host-nation-funded construc-tion programs	ASpt	AR	Needs update and review		17.5	No	J4/ILED
DoDD 4500.53	5/15/87	Commercial passenger airlift management and quality control	EDir	OT	Needs update		12.9	Yes	J4/MD
DoDD 4120.11	7/9/93	Standardization of mobile electric power generating sources	LAgt	AR			6.7	Yes	J4/ILED
DoDD 5154.6	4/29/93	Armed Services medical regulat-ing	SMgr	OT		USTC	6.9	Yes	J4/MRD
DoDD 5160.65	3/8/95	Single manager for conventional ammunition	SMgr	AR			5.0	Yes	J4/LRD
DoDI 5160.68	3/3/95	Single manager for conventional ammunition (SMCA): Responsibilities of the SMCA and the military serv-ices	SMgr	AR			5.0	Yes	J4/LRD

*The highlighted numbers indicate directives that are 10 years or older.

Appendix C
DoD Issuances and Memorandum Requiring Update

Tables C-1 and C-2 contain selective DoD directives and instructions, respectively, that reflect coordination responsibility beyond the JS, J4. These tables are not inclusive but reflect directions and instructions that should be reviewed for applicability and retention. Table C-3 contains OSD regulations, OSD memoranda, and other documents that the services report as rationale for accomplishing functions. These should be reviewed for continued relevance, particularly the highlighted items in all tables, which indicate items that are more than 10 years old.

Table C-1. Non-JS, J4, DoD Directives

DoDD Number*	Date	Subject	EA	OPR/ AOPR	Remarks	Age (Yrs)	WEAR	POC
1010.1	12/9/94	Military Personnel Drug Abuse Testing Program		OT	Assume that Svc providing admin spt to Cbt Cmd is EA	5.6	N	J1/ PRD
1015.8	10/22/85	DoD civilian employee morale, welfare and recreation activities and supporting non-appropriated fund instruments	EAgt	OT/ Svcs	UPDATE EA unclear, not proper term	14.5	N	J1/ PRD
1100.18	1/31/86	Wartime manpower mobilization planning			UPDATE	13.5	N	J1/ PRD
1315.6	8/26/78	Responsibilities for military troop construction support of the Department of the Air Force overseas	DSpt	AR	Needs update J4 responsibility	24.7	Y	
1322.12	4/12/74	Funded legal education			Update	23.2	N	

Table C-1. Non-JS, J4, DoD Directives (Continued)

DoDD Number	Date	Subject	EA	OPR/ AOPR	Remarks	Age (Yrs)	WEAR	POC
1330.17	3/12/87	Armed Services commissary store regulations			Needs update	13.1	N	
1332.34	10/22/85	Voluntary state tax withholding from retired pay			Update	8.4	N	
2100.3	7/11/63	United States policy relative to commitments to foreign governments under foreign assistance programs			Needs update	27.9	N	
3020.36	11/2/88	Assignment of national security emergency preparedness responsibilities to DoD components	EAgt	AR	UPDATE	6.3	N	J3/ NMCC
3025.1	1/15/93	Military support to civil authorities	EAgt	AR	UPDATE	7.1	N	J3/ JOD
3100.3	9/27/63	Cooperation with allies in research and development of defense equipment			Old; ambiguous	31.9	N	
3100.4	9/27/63	Harmonization of qualitative requirements for defense equipment of the United States and its allies			Old; ambiguous	36.9	N	
3405.1	4/2/87	Computer programming language policy			Needs update; OSD 26 Aug 94 memo confuses issue	13.0	N	
4270.5	3/2/82	Military construction responsibilities	CAgt	OT/ AR, NA	Needs update, refs invalid	18.2	N	

Table C-1. Non-JS, J4, DoD Directives (Continued)

DoDD Number	Date	Subject	EA	OPR/ AOPR	Remarks	Age (Yrs)	WEAR	POC
4500.37	4/2/87	Management of the DoD Intermodal Container System	Agt	OT/ AF, NA	Reqs review. Ctrs not in DTS must be included	13.0	Y	
5010.10	8/9/72	Intelligence Career Development Program	EAgt	OT/ DIA	Needs update	5.3	N	J1/ PRD
5030.57	5/3/77	Special warnings to mariners			Incorporate in DoDD 5105.60	23.1	N	
5040.2	12/7/87	Visual information			UPDATE; refs do not exist	9.7	N	
5100.27	12/29/64	Delineation of international logistic responsibilities			Update—old	35.6	N	
5100.41	5/1/91	Executive agent responsibilities for the National Communications System	EAgt	OT/ SEC DEF, DISA	Update to reflect DISA	8.9	Y	J6/ J6T
5100.47	4/30/65	National Cryptologic School			Needs update	35.3	N	
5100.9	9/22/55	Delegation of authority pursuant to Executive Order 10621			No record of EO 10621 being active	45.0	N	
5105.19	6/25/91	Defense Information Systems Agency	EAgt	OT/ DISA	CJCS reports to SECDEF on DISA's responsiveness & readiness to spt operating forces.	8.7	Y	J6/ J6A
5105.38	8/10/78	Defense Security Assistance Agency			Update— MAAG reporting not IAW UCP	21.8	N	
5120.20	12/17/91	Armed Forces Radio And Television Service			Add deliberate planning to this DoDD	2.1	Y	

Table C-1. Non-JS, J4, DoD Directives (Continued)

DoDD Number	Date	Subject	EA	OPR/ AOPR	Remarks	Age (Yrs)	WEAR	POC
5122.10	2/14/95	American Forces Information Service			DoDD 5122.11 states AFIS is EA; this does not contain	5.0	N	J5/ POL
5132.10	12/14/73	Security assistance technical assistance field teams	AAgt	OT/ AR	Needs review	25.9	N	J5/ WHEM
5145.3	10/19/62	Surveillance of DoD security programs			Delete. Include in DoDD 5200.2. Most references cancelled.	33.4	N	
5158.4	1/8/93	United States Transportation Command			Needs update to add comcmd of Def Cour Svc	7.2	N	
5210.64	11/6/78	Alternate Joint Communications Center Protection Program	EMgr	AR	Review for consistency	5.3	Y	
5210.70	11/3/80	DoD cryptologic training			Needs update and consolidate	19.5	N	
5220.22	12/8/80	DoD Industrial Security Program	EAgt	OT/ SEC DEF	Needs update	19.4	N	
5230.16	12/20/93	Nuclear accident and incident public affairs guidance			Needs update. DoDD 5100.52 does not exist	6.2	N	OCJCS PA

C-4

Table C-1. Non-JS, J4, DoD Directives (Continued)

DoDD Number	Date	Subject	EA	OPR/ AOPR	Remarks	Age (Yrs)	WEAR	POC
5410.10	2/2/60	Coordination and clearance of announce- ments of per- sonnel reductions, closures of in- stallations and reductions of contract opera- tions in the United States			Needs update. Review for chgs in- curred by BRAC	32.0	N	
5410.18	7/3/74	Community relations			Needs update	23.7	N	OCJCS PA
5500.11	5/27/71	Nondiscrimina- tion in federally assisted programs			Needs update. Much law in the interim	27.9	N	
5510.3	6/30/80	Authority to convene gen- eral courts mar- tial			Needs update. Cmd alignment changes	16.5	N	
5525.5	1/15/86	DoD coopera- tion with civilian law enforcement officials			Needs update— drug policy has evolved	10.3	N	
5530.3	6/11/87	International agreements			Needs update	9.1	N	J5
5535.2	10/16/80	Delegations of authority to the secretaries of the military departments— inventions and patents	MCtl	OT	Outdated	19.6	N	
6050.16	9/20/91	DoD policy for establishing and implementing environmental standards at overseas installations	EAgt	OT/ ASD (P&L)	Update	8.5	N	
7060.3	3/9/79	International Balance of Payments Pro- gram—nonap- propriated fund activities			Needs update; world has contracted	15.5	N	

Table C-1. Non-JS, J4, DoD Directives (Continued)

DoDD Number	Date	Subject	EA	OPR/ AOPR	Remarks	Age (Yrs)	WEAR	POC
7220.8	8/16/56	Policies and procedures governing the use of the authority of Section 3732, revised statutes			Needs update	38.5	N	
C-030.43	3/26/70	Significant military exercises			CJCSI 2420.01A will replace Jan 99	30.3	N	J3/ JED
S-210.36	6/10/86	Provision of DoD-sensitive support to DoD components and other departments and agencies of the U.S. government			In rewrite— final coordination	2.1	N	J3/ SOD

*Highlighted numbers indicate items that are more than 10 years old.

Table C-2. Non-JS, J4, DoD Instructions

DoDI Number	Date	Subject	EA	OPR/ AOPR	Remarks	Age	WEAR	POC
1322.20	3/14/91	Development and management of interactive courseware for military training	LActy	OT/DLA	Best proponent?	5.3	N	
4100.31	9/2/60	Reports on single manager operations			Needs update; consider canceling. All DoDD are invalid. Reporting probably covered elsewhere.	27.1	N	
4140.50	12/9/82	Management of DoD locomotives	EAgt	AR	Needs update	17.4	N	

Table C-2. Non-JS, J4, DoD Instructions (Continued)

DoDI Number	Date	Subject	EA	OPR/ AOPR	Remarks	Age	WEAR	POC
4165.14	12/21/66	Inventory of military real property			Needs update	22.8	N	
5305.5	5/23/66	Space management procedures, National Capital Region			Needs update	34.2	N	
5330.1	7/6/54	Printing, binding and related equipment programs			Needs update	38.7	N	
5410.19	7/19/79	Armed Forces community relations	EAgt	OT	Needs update	20.8	N	
5430.1	1/22/57	Participation of military personnel in commercially sponsored radio-television broadcasts not of a public service nature			Needs update. Many changes since 60s	39.2	N	
5435.2	4/25/75	Delegation of authority to approve travel in and use of military carriers for public affairs purposes			Needs update	25.1	N	
6015.17	3/17/83	Planning and acquisition of military health facilities			Needs update	17.1	N	
7730.58	9/26/83	Reports on personnel distributions by country or other specific location			Needs update. Modern DBs may have made this OBE.	14.5	N	
7730.59	9/17/79	Monthly report of assigned military personnel strengths			Needs update	19.2	N	

Table C-2. Non-JS, J4, DoD Instructions (Continued)

DoDI Number	Date	Subject	EA	OPR/ AOPR	Remarks	Age	WEAR	POC
7760.3	6/16/55	Requisitioning of printing, duplicating and reproduction work (DD forms 843 and 844)			Needs update	38.7	N	
7770.1	3/6/87	Magnetic tape extracts of re-tired military pay records		OT/ DFAS	Update Ntech	13.1	N	
7770.2	7/26/83	Magnetic tape extracts of military pay re-cords		OT/ DFAS	Update Ntech	16.8	N	
7930.2	12/31/79	ADP software exchange and release			Needs update; soft-ware has changed	20.4	N	

Table C-3. Non-JS, J4, DoD Regulations and Memorandums

Number*	Date	Subject	EA	OPR/ AOPR	Remarks	Age	WEAR	POC
DoD 4145.19-R	June 78	Storage and warehousing fa-cilities and serv-ices		AR	OBE	22.0	N	
DoD 4145.19-R-1	Sep. 79	Storage and ma-terials handling			OBE	20.7	N	
DoD 4160.21-H	June 85	Defense Scrap Yard Handbook			OBE	13.5	N	
DoD 5100.52-M	Sep. 90	Nuclear weapon accident response procedures			OBE	8.3	N	
Unknown	Mar. 96	Joint Oil Analysis Program		OT/ UNK	DoD pro-ponent is required	2.8		
ASD (FM&P) memo	5/5/92	Support to the Red Cross during times of conflict	LAgy	AR	DoDD should cover	7.9	Y	

C-8

Table C-3. Non-JS, J4, DoD Regulations and Memorandums (Continued)

Number	Date	Subject	EA	OPR/ AOPR	Remarks	Age	WEAR	POC
ASD (Comptroller) memo	6/12/79	Oversea transportation of Army and Air Force exchange service merchandise—financial responsibility		AR	No DoDD talks about this issue	20.9		
ASD (MRA&L) memo	12/15/91	Stars And Stripes Newspaper financial reporting		AR	No DoDD 5120.4	8.3		
ASD (MRA&L) memos	10/19/78	Defense complex–Panama real estate project office		AR	Bad date	20.5		
ASD (MRA) memo	3/14/86	Interallied Confederation of Reserve Officers	EAgt	AR	Needs DoDD	14.1		
ASD memo	12/23/91	DoD U.S. POW/MIA Program		AF	OUSD (P)	8.2		
D, NSA, USSIDs 240 and 341	Jan. 90	Airborne ELINT exploitation		AF	Bad date	10.2		
DASD/C3I (CI) memo, DoDD 5240.6 & 5240.2	2/24/92	Counterintelligence support to the Ballistic Missile Defense Office		AF	OBE 5240.6 does not exist; 5240.6 dtd 1997	8.1		
DDR&E memo	7/1/76	Advanced medium range air-to-air missile	ESvc	OT/ AF, NA	OSD direction for AF/ NA prgm w/AF as ESvc	23.9		
Def Engy PP memo 86-3	Jan. 86	Energy conservation and conversion technologies		AF	Bad date	14.3		

Table C-3. Non-JS, J4, DoD Regulations and Memorandums (Continued)

Number	Date	Subject	EA	OPR/ AOPR	Remarks	Age	WEAR	POC
Defense Environmental Policy Council voice vote	Jan. 92	NATO Committee for the Challenges of Modern Society		AF	Bad date	8.2		
DEPSECDEF memo	8/20/91	Support to federal agencies in immigration emergencies		AR	Put into DoDD?	8.6		
DEPSECDEF memo	11/29/90	Consolidation of corrections within the Department of Defense	EAgt	AR	Needs DoDD	8.6		
MOA (NAT-664)	Apr. 79	Memorandum of agreement between Federal Aviation Administration and USAF DoD for operation and maintenance of the R-2508 complex.		AF	Still Valid?	21.1		
MOU DARPA/AFT AC/Air Staff & DARPA/Air Staff	3/1/77	Defense Applied Research Projects Agency assistance		AF	Still Valid?	12.7		
OASD memo	Jan. 90	DoD Lock Program		NA	Bad date	10.2		
OSD Direction, 1982. PMD 6027(24)647 70F/207581F	Jan. 82	Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (Joint Stars)		AF	OBE	18.3		
OSD/OGC designation	Jan. 90	Agency counsel in selected lawsuits		AF	Bad date	10.2		
OSD/OGC designation	Jan. 90	Black Hawk litigation—Mounsey v. Allied-Signal, Inc.		AF	Bad date	10.2		
OSD/OGC designation	Jan. 92	Persian Gulf Syndrome claims and litigation		AF	Bad date	8.2		

Table C-3. Non-JS, J4, DoD Regulations and Memorandums (Continued)

Number	Date	Subject	EA	OPR/ AOPR	Remarks	Age	WEAR	POC
OUSD (P) memo	4/4/86	Counterintelligence support to Washington Headquarters Service, Office of the Secretary of Defense		AF	OBE	11.4		
SECDEF decision memo	Jan. 90	Electro-optical sensor systems acquisition milestone decision for the Advanced Tactical Air Reconnaissance System		AF	Bad date	10.2		
SECDEF memo	Jan. 90	Executive agent requirements management logistics integrated standard systems	EAgt	AF	Bad date	10.2		

*Highlighted items are more than 10 years old.

Appendix D
Proposed DoD Directive

We provide the following template to assist in developing a DoD directive that will refine and standardize EA and other delegations of responsibility in the DoD.

Department of Defense

DIRECTIVE

Date   NUMBER 5XXX.X

SUBJECT: Executive Agent and Other Delegations of Responsibility

References: (a) DoD Directive 5025.1, "DoD Directives System," 24 June 1994

        (b) DoD Directive 5100.1, "Functions of the Department of Defense and its Major Components," 1 May 1985

        (c) DoD Manual 5025.1-M, "DoD Directives System Procedures," August 1994

        (d) JP 1-02, "DoD Dictionary Military and Associated Terms," As Amended 10 June 1998

        (e) DoD Directive 5110.4, "Washington Headquarters Services (WHS)," 6 May 1991

1.   <u>PURPOSE</u>

   This Directive defines the use of executive agents within the Department of Defense beyond that contained in reference (a). It also provides policy regarding the appropriate designation to use when delegating responsibilities within the DoD. Additionally, it articulates management policies to insure that all directed or delegated support relationships or responsibilities that affect one or mores services and impact resource requirements in peace and/or war are quantified and visible.

2.   <u>APPLICABILITY</u>

   This Directive applies to the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), the Military Departments, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Unified Combatant Commands, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense (IG, DoD), the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, the Defense Agencies, and the DoD Field Activities (hereafter referred to collectively as "the DoD Components").

3. <u>DEFINITION</u>

3.1   <u>Administrative Agent (AA)</u>. (Proposed) A term used in DoD regulations to indicate a directed responsibility that involves the organization and management of a function for the DoD. Administrative Agent delegation must be conferred by a DoD Issuance that will contain the specific responsibilities included in the delegation. When the delegation is provided in a DoD Instruction, the overarching DoD Directive that authorizes the action will be referenced.

3.2   <u>Executive agent (EA)</u>. A term used in Department of Defense and Service regulations to indicate a delegation of authority by a superior to a subordinate to act on behalf of the superior. An agreement between equals does not create an executive agent. Executive agent delegations are conferred by the Secretary of Defense through DoD Directive. Executive agent delegations are distinct from Lead Agents, described below. Designation as executive agent, in and of itself, confers no authority. The exact nature and scope of the authority delegated must be stated in the document designating the executive agent. An executive agent may be limited to providing only administration and support or coordinating common functions or it may include direction, and control over specified resources for specified purposes, as well.

3.3   <u>Single manager (SM)</u>. A Military Department or Agency designated by the Secretary of Defense to be responsible for management of specified commodities or common service activities on a Department of Defense-wide basis. Single manager delegations are similar to executive agents. There are multiple single manager designations within the DoD. Two examples follow.

3.3.1   <u>Single manager for transportation</u>. The United States Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM) is the Department of Defense single manager for transportation, other than Service-unique or theater-assigned transportation assets. See also Service-unique transportation assets; theater-assigned transportation assets; United States Transportation Command.

3.3.2   <u>Single port manager</u>. USTRANSCOM, through its transportation component command, Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC), is the DoD-designated single port manager for all common-user seaports worldwide. The single port manager performs those functions necessary to support the strategic flow of the deploying forces' equipment and sustainment supply in the sealift port of embarkation and hand-off to the theater commander-in-chief (CINC) in the sealift port of debarkation (SPOD). The single port manager is responsible for providing strategic deployment status information to the CINC and to workload the SPOD Port Operator base on the CINC's priorities and guidance. The single port manager is responsible through all phases of the theater port operations continuum, from a bare beach deployment to a commercial contract supported deployment. Also

called SPM. See also transportation component command; United States Transportation Command.

3.4   Lead agency. Designated among US Government agencies to coordinate the interagency oversight of the day-to-day conduct of an ongoing operation. The lead agency is to chair the interagency working group established to coordinate policy related to a particular operation. The lead agency determines the agenda, ensures cohesion among the agencies and is responsible for implementing decisions.

3.5   Lead agent. A Lead agent is a DoD Component or a subordinate organization of a DoD Component, which has been assigned lead responsibility for coordinating and providing specified support. The specific responsibilities of the lead agent are defined though agreements between or among DoD Components or other US Government organizations. DoD Components may be assigned as lead agents for developing and maintaining joint doctrine, joint tactics, techniques, and procedures (JTTP) publications, or joint administrative publications, and common support. The lead agent is responsible for developing, coordinating, reviewing, maintaining, and executing assigned doctrine, JTTP, joint administrative publication, or business process. A lead agent may also be designated by a CINC to provide specified common user logistics support in a particular operation.

3.6   Dominant User: The concept that the Service that is the principal consumer will have the responsibility for performance of a support workload for all using Services.

3.7   Common Use Provider: A Department of Defense agency or a Military Department that provides services, materials, or facilities on a common basis for two or more Department of Defense agencies.

4.   POLICY

4.1   Executive agent designation within the DoD is conferred in instances where there is no existing or anticipated means to accomplish DoD or service objectives or there is a clearly defined need to focus DoD or service resources on a specific DoD responsibility. The designation of an EA is appropriate at the DoD level, and is conferred by DoD Directive. Consequently, combatant commanders and the DoD Components will use the term "lead agent" or other approved term to confer EA-like responsibilities that are not designated by the Secretary or Deputy Secretary of Defense.

4.2   A DoD Directive establishing an executive agent should define the function to be performed, the extent of the responsibility, duration of the intended assignment (if known), the conditions under which the executive agent responsibilities will be implemented, the scope of the responsibilities, and the organizations to be supported. Supported organizations may include DoD and non-DoD organizations. Responsibilities of supported organizations in the relationship should also be defined, e.g., requirement specifications, data support. Where warranted and authorized in the establishing DoD

Directive, executive agent responsibilities may be further delegated. Per reference (c), implementing DoD instructions, manuals, and regulations are appropriate, if warranted and authorized in the establishing DoD Directive.

4.3   Lead Agents are established by DoD Components, via memoranda, instructions or similar vehicles for enacting agreements between or among the Components, or between DoD and other US Government organizations. Such agreements should specify the terms of the relationships among the participating organizations in detail similar to that required of Executive Agent establishing directives. The scope of the Lead Agent responsibility is typically within a larger DoD context.

4.4   Administrative Agent delegations are appropriate when the delegated function is mainly administrative in nature. Examples would include providing office space and resources to operate the activity. The use of an Administrative Agent is appropriate when there is no operational or direct wartime implication.

4.5   Review and Oversight. DoD-level EA and other designations will receive formal, periodic review. These designations will be reviewed no later than every three years. The purpose of these reviews is to ensure that the requirement for an executive agent and other delegations remain valid, that the responsibilities are being effectively executed and the participating organizations are satisfied that the arrangement should continue, or to recommend changes to the arrangement. These reviews will coincide with the review cycle of reference (c), paragraph 4-1-20. Similarly, DoD Component and combatant command lead agent agreements should specify a review and evaluation cycle, as part of the terms of the agreement. The Office of the Secretary of Defense, Director of Administration and Management will maintain a catalogue of executive agent and lead agent agreements currently in effect. This catalog will be made available to DoD Components for planning and programming purposes, and will be updated semi-annually. DoD Components will report existing and new lead agent designations to the Director, Administration and Management, OSD, annually.

5.   RESPONSIBILITIES

5.1   The Director of Administration and Management, Office of the Secretary of Defense, shall:

5.1.1   Review and coordinate on ALL DoD issuances that assign Executive Agent responsibilities.

5.1.2   Maintain a repository of all DoD and DoD Component designations of Executive or Lead Agents. This repository will include details regarding the scope, duration, and intent of the designation, the date of its last validation, and a characterization as to the scope of the designation. This repository will be revised semi-annually and be made available to all DoD components

5.1.3 Perform periodic review of Executive Agent designations not earlier than every three years.

5.1.4 Insure that record management procedures of reference (e) include a time duration where OSD PSA memoranda designate executive or lead agent responsibilities.

5.2 <u>OSD Principal Staff Assistants</u> shall:

5.2.1 Monitor the status of Executive or Lead Agent designations within their assigned functional areas of responsibility.

5.2.2 Review their Executive, Administrative, or Lead Agent designations at least every three years for need and currency. Notify by memorandum to DA&M, OSD, whether the designations will be continued, revised, or cancelled.

5.2.3 Provide all existing or newly assigned administrative or lead agent designations, through directive, memoranda, or guidance, to the Director of Administration and Management, Office of the Secretary of Defense as they are developed.

5.3 The <u>Heads of the DoD Components</u> shall:

5.3.1 Refer to their OSD proponent or the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff proposals for designation of a DoD Executive Agent.

5.3.2 Identify the source of Lead or Administrative Agent designation, e.g., EUCOM Lead Agent for Environmental Matters in XXX.

5.3.3 Report Lead and Administrative Agent designations to the DA&M, OSD, annually. This report will include details regarding the scope, duration, and intent of the designation, the date of inception, date of last validation, and a characterization as to the scope of the designation. This information will populate the OSD directory.

5.3.4 Ensure that Lead and Administrative Agent designations include the scope, duration, and limitations on the designation.

5.4 The Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff shall:

5.4.1 Maintain active liaison with the DM, OSD to monitor Executive, Lead and Administrative Agent designations for impact on peacetime or wartime responsibilities.

5.4.2 Provide input to DM, OSD regarding the application of the Executive, Lead and Administrative Agent designations to peace, war, or both. Insure that the OSD directory reflects this determination.

5.4.3 Incorporate into the Joint Planning System policy guidance that is consistent in both planning and programming. The intent is to insure that Executive, Lead and Administrative Agent designations are visible in peacetime and wartime so that there is no ambiguity regarding responsibilities for providing needed capabilities to support national military objectives.

6. <u>EFFECTIVE DATE</u>

This Directive is effective immediately.

/s/

Deputy Secretary of Defense

Appendix E
Abbreviations

A&T	Acquisition and Technology
AO	area of operations
AOPR	alternate office of primary responsibility
ASBP	Armed Services Blood Program
ASD	Assistant Secretary of Defense
ASD (HA)	Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs
BTC	blood transshipment center
C3I	Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence
CAAP	Critical Asset Assurance Program
CINC	Commander in Chief
CINCACOM	Commander in Chief, Atlantic Command
CINCTRANS	Commander in Chief, U.S. Transportation Command
CJCS	Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
CONUS	continental United States
DDESB	DoD Explosives Safety Board
DEPSECDEF	Deputy Secretary of Defense
DFRIF	Defense Freight Railway Interchange Fleet
DISA	Defense Information Systems Agency
DMSB	Defense Medical Standardization Board
DoD	Department of Defense
DoDD	Department of Defense directive
DoDI	Department of Defense instruction
DSA	Defense Support Agencies
DTTS	Defense Transportation Tracking System
EA	executive agent
EPW	enemy prisoners of war
ISP	Industrial Security Program
JCS	Joint Chiefs of Staff

JFCOM	Joint Forces Command
JIRSG	Joint interservice regional support group
JS	Joint Staff
LNO	liaison officer
MHE/CHE	materiel- and container-handling equipment
MOP	Memorandum of Policy
MTMC	Military Traffic Management Command
MUL	Master Urgency List
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NIPRNET	Unclassified but Sensitive Internet Protocol Router Network
OPLANS	operations plans
OPR	office of primary responsibility
OSD	Office of Secretary of Defense
PSA	principal staff assistants
RI	responsible individual
SECDEF	Secretary of Defense
SOF	Special Operations Forces
TBTC	transportable blood transshipment center
TJTN	Theater Joint Tactical Networks
UCP	Unified Command Plan
USJFCOM	United States Joint Forces Command
USSOCOM	United States Special Operations Command
USTRANSCOM	United States Transportation Command
WEAR	wartime executive agent responsibility
WMD	weapons of mass destruction

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. REPORT DATE	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED *(From - To)*
10-2000	Final	

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
Logistics-Related DoD Executive Agents: An Assessment

5a. CONTRACT NUMBER
DASW01-95-C-0019

5b. GRANT NUMBER

5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER

6. AUTHOR(S)
Di Fiore, Matthew F.; Author
Glicoes, Laurence ; Author

5d. PROJECT NUMBER

5e. TASK NUMBER
JS713

5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

Logistics Management Institute
2000 Corporate Ridge
McLean, VA 22102-7805

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
LMI-JS713R1

9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
CDR David F. Baucom
JS, J4 SMPED
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20318-4000

10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
J4JS, JCS J4, SMPED

11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
A. Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT
DoD issuances and other documents confer executive agent responsibilities in DoD. LMI reviewed logistics-related executive agent delegations in OSD issuances and evaluated their currency and need. Our review revealed that the management of executive agent delegation in the DoD requires attention and ongoing review. We also documented where changes in missions and functions over time have not been reflected in authoritative documents. The OSD staff is responsible for procedural changes. The report recommends a process for bringing the management of both logistics- and non-logistics-related DoD issuances under control within 6 months.

15. SUBJECT TERMS
Executive agent; lead agent; Wartime Executive Agent Responsibility; WEAR; OPLAN; DoD Issuances; DoD Directive; DoD Instruction; OSD Memoranda; Principal Staff Assistant (PSA)

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	**b. ABSTRACT**	**c. THIS PAGE**	Unclassified Unlimited	64	Nancy E. Handy
UNCLASSIFIED	UNCLASSIFIED	UNCLASSIFIED			**19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER** *(include area code)* 703-917-7249